



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/501,035	02/09/2000	Shulong Li	2082B	3328
25280	7590	08/29/2011	EXAMINER	
Legal Department (M-495)			THOMPSON, CAMIE S	
P.O. Box 1926			ART UNIT	
Spartanburg, SC 29304			PAPER NUMBER	
			1786	
			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			08/29/2011	
			PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary****Application No.**

09/501,035

**Applicant(s)**

LI, SHULONG

**Examiner**

CAMIE THOMPSON

**Art Unit**

1786

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Amendment filed 6/6/2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on \_\_\_\_; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 20-22 and 24-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 20-22, 24-35 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_

Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Applicant's amendment and accompanying remarks filed June 6, 2011 are acknowledged.
2. Examiner acknowledges amended claims 20, 25, 27 and 35.
3. Examiner acknowledges cancelled claim 23.
4. The rejection of claims 20-35 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph is withdrawn due to applicant's argument.
5. The rejection of claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is overcome by applicant's amendment.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The written disclosure does not provide for "aggregate".

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 24-26 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 24 is dependent upon claim 20, which recites that the first layer has an add-on weight from about 0.3 to about 2.5 ounces/square yard. Claim 24 recites that at least one layer of coating comprising polyurethane has an add-on weight of from 0.6 to about 1.5 ounces/square yard. It is unclear if the "at least one layer of coating comprising polyurethane" is the first or second layer. The second layer in claim 20 is only defined as not comprising silicone. The second layer in claim 20 can have polyurethane.
10. Claims 25-26 are rendered indefinite because it is unclear if the term "aggregate" is referring to the coating. The term "aggregate" lacks antecedent basis.
11. Claim 30 is rendered indefinite because it depends on cancelled claim 23.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

12. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

13. Claims 20-22, 24-26 and 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Veiga et al., U.S. Pre Grant Publication Number 2002/0022420.

Veiga discloses an air bag comprising a knit, woven or non-woven fabric substrate that has a plurality of polyurethane coatings (see paragraph 0009). Reference claim 1 discloses that the first layer is an adhesive polyurethane and that the second coating layer is an elastomeric polyurethane as per instant claims 20 and 24-26. Reference claim 7 discloses that the first coating layer has a coating weight of from about 03 ounces/square yard to about 1.5 ounces/square yard as per instant claims 20 and 24-26. Claims 21 and 22 recite a product that undergoes treatment. The treatment process is not given any patentable weight. Claims 21 and 22 recite an air bag comprising a fabric that has a first coating layer of polyurethane and a second coating wherein the add-on weight of the first coating is from about 03 ounces/square yard to about 1.5 ounces/square yard. The air bag of the Veiga reference discloses an air bag comprising a fabric substrate that has a plurality of polyurethane coatings. The present claims do not exclude polyurethane as being present in the second layer. The Veiga reference discloses an airbag with the same components as the presently claimed airbag. Therefore, it would be expected that the air bag of the Veiga exhibits upon inflation to a peak initial pressure of 30 psi using a 6.7 liter compressed nitrogen gas tank to 12 volumes of gas, a gas retention of at least 1 psi at a point in time at least 10 seconds subsequent to inflation at peak initial pressure because it is the same airbag as presently claimed. Additionally, it would be expected that the coating system of the Veiga reference has a tensile strength of at least 600 psi because the Veiga reference comprises a coating system as recited by present claims 35 and 35. Examiner takes the position that the term "aggregate" is referring to the coating layer(s).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claims 27-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veiga et al., U.S. Pre Grant Publication 2002/00224 in view of Kami et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,114,180. Veiga discloses an air bag comprising a knit, woven or non-woven fabric substrate that has a plurality of polyurethane coatings (see paragraph 0009). Reference claim 1 discloses that the first layer is an adhesive polyurethane and that the second coating layer is an elastomeric polyurethane. Reference claim 7 discloses that the first coating layer has a coating weight of from about 03 ounces/square yard to about 1.5 ounces/square yard. Examiner takes the position that the term "aggregate" is referring to the coating layer(s). Veiga does not disclose that the airbag is a jacquard woven. Kami discloses a woven air bag having a coating film applied thereon (see abstract). Column 6, lines 17-19 discloses that the coating film can be a polyurethane rubber. Additionally, Kami discloses that the coating film is applied on the surface of the woven fabric wherein the woven fabric is a jacquard woven (see Ex. 7). The type of fabric used affects the air permeability of the air bag. Jacquard wovens have a higher air permeability. Also, jacquard wovens have higher strength. Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a Jacquard woven fabric in the Veiga reference in order to have increased air permeability so that the air bag will not burst when inflated.

### *Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CAMIE THOMPSON whose telephone number is (571)272-1530. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00 am - 6:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jennifer Chriss can be reached on 571-272-7783. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/CAMIE THOMPSON/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1786

